



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,865	08/27/2001	Reuben Hertz		3746

31877 7590 10/28/2004

ALLEN D. HERTZ
12784 TULIPWOOD CIRCLE
BOCA RATON, FL 33428

EXAMINER

ROSE, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/939,865

Applicant(s)

HERTZ, REUBEN

Examiner

Robert Rose

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14-25,27-38 and 43-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14-25,27-38,43,44 and 46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 3, 13, 26, 32, and 39-42 have been canceled.
2. Claims 43-46 have been added.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-12, 14-15, 19, 29-31, 33-34, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stark, et al. Stark, et al disclose an apparatus for propelling a stream of particulate matter comprising all of the subject matter set forth in the claims above. A compressed gas source is delivered to a mixing chamber through a gas receiving port, and mixes with abrasive within the chamber, followed by discharge through a discharge conduit to strike a target material. The limitation of the particle-directing tube being "bendable" is a functional limitation which is deemed sufficiently broad to read on the discharge tube of Stark, et al. While not shown as having a bend, the material in Stark is certainly capable of being bent. The device of Stark et al is of a size and shape to allow the nozzle to be hand-held.
5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3723

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6-8, 16-18, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark, et al in view of Dougherty. Dougherty discloses the known use of color coding of containers to identify the contents therein, and further disclose the known use of an end cap(70) for sealing the discharge end of a chamber to prevent the contents from being discharged. The use of color coding to help identify the contents of the chamber would have been obvious in view of Dougherty. Such color coding is used throughout industry for discriminating between similar looking containers, and for identifying their contents. To further provide an end cap at the distal end of the discharge conduit to prevent inadvertent discharge of the media from the chamber when not in use, would have been obvious in view of Dougherty.

7. Claims 20-21, 27-28, 43, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark et al in view of Schur et al. In-as-much as Applicant is only entitled to the filing date of the CIP application for the new subject matter directed to the self-sealing mechanism recited in claim 20, the Schur et al reference is deemed to constitute prior art against this set of claims. Schur et al disclose a self-sealing one-way valve located within the chamber upstream of the gas receiving port. To provide such a one-way valve in the chamber of Stark et al upstream of the gas receiving port, to prevent backflow of media would have been obvious in view of Schur et al.

8. Claims 22-25, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark et al in view of Schur et al and further in view of Daubenberger et al. Schur et al teaches to provide a check-valve in a location between the gas receiving port and

Art Unit: 3723

the mixing chamber to prevent backflow of the abrasive media. Daubenberger et al disclose a check-valve for one-way flow of media through a passageway comprising a hemispherical-shaped flexible material having a slit which closes to prevent backflow of media through the valve. To provide such a conventional hemispherical-shaped check-valve in the location taught by Schur et al to prevent backflow of media while minimizing the number of moving parts prone to wear, would have been obvious in view of Daubenberger et al.

9. Claim 45 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Applicant's arguments filed January 16, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to applicant's new limitation wherein "the mixing chamber is pre-charged with a particulate matter..." is deemed to be readable on Stark et al. Note that in Stark et al the mixing chamber holds a quantity of particulate matter, and is considered pre-charged if the air pressure is turned off during use, as at least some of the particulate could remain in the chamber. Never-the-less, Claims 1, 10, and 29 would be allowable over Stark et al if a recitation of the mixing chamber being pre-charged with "a fixed amount of particulate matter" and the gas delivery conduit "contributing no additional particulate matter to that contained in the mixing chamber" is incorporated into the claims. With regard to independent claim 20 Schur disclose the location and structure of a check valve claimed in claim 20. The Schur patent predates

Art Unit: 3723


the filing date of Applicant's CIP subject matter by more than one year, thus applicant's affidavit is not deemed sufficient to overcome the art of record.

11. In view of the lack of treatment of claims 39-42 in the last Office action, this action is not being made final.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert Rose at telephone number (703) 308-1360.

rr

October 25, 2004.


ROBERT A. ROSE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 323